



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,235	09/22/2006	Masamoto Tago	NEC 04NPCT008	6133

27667 7590 01/08/2009
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718

EXAMINER

GEBREYESUS, YOSEF

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4183

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/08/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/599,235	Applicant(s) TAGO, MASAMOTO	
	Examiner YOSEF GEBREYESUS	Art Unit 4183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the subject matter in claims 29, 36 and 37 “the same as the height” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2 Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 25 recites the limitation interposer “chip” in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend the –chip- or define a chip earlier in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-26,29,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. (US 6,836,002) in view of Dotta et al. (US 2004/0080040).

Regarding claim 25, Figure 1(b) of Chikawa et al. discloses a stacked-chip semiconductor device 1 comprising: an interposer substrate 2; and a plurality of semiconductor chips 3 and 4

Art Unit: 4183

overlaid two tiers deep and mounted on said interposer chip 2, where in at least one of said semiconductor chips has a thick film wiring 6, and a voltage is fed from said interposer substrate 2 by way of thick-film wiring 6 to a circuit surface (col. 3 lines 36-37) of another semiconductor chip 4 that is disposed above said semiconductor chip 3. Chikawa et al. does not expressly teach the electrical connection is at least one voltage selected from power supply and voltage and ground. However, Figure 1a, 1b and 9 Dotta et al. teaches stacked-chip semiconductor device 40, wherein the first conducting member 8 that feeds a power supply 8a and ground 8b (paragraph [0040]) to the circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip 1a, and at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground is fed from said interposer substrate 30 to the circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip 1a. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Chikawa et al. by teachings of Dotta et al. to connect the semiconductor chips with power supply voltage and ground in order operate the semiconductor devices.

Regarding claim 26, Figure 1(b) of Chikawa discloses all the claimed invention as applied to claim 25 above. Figure 1(b) of Chikawa discloses a plurality of semiconductor chips being composed of: a first semiconductor chip 3 that has a circuit surface on upper surface (col. 4 line 66-67) and said thick film wiring; and second semiconductor chip 4 that is disposed above said first semiconductor chip 3 bonding wires for electrically connecting said interposer substrate 2 and thick-film wiring 6 and bonding wires 7 for electrical connecting (col. 3 lines 58-61). Chikawa failed to disclose a plurality of bumps for providing electrical connection and a plurality of through wires on a second semiconductor chip 4 and at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground is fed through. However, in the same field of endeavor,

Art Unit: 4183

Figure (10 and 13) of Dotta et al. discloses a plurality of bumps 310 between the semiconductor devices 301a and 301b and plurality of through wires 306 (paragraph [0009]) to establish electrical connection between the interposer substrate 30 and the semiconductor chip 1b. Dotta et al. also teaches in a semiconductor device the through electrode has multiple power-supply though electrodes, grounding and signal routing (paragraph [0400]). In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to modify the invention of Chikawa et al. as taught by Dotta et al. to form semiconductor chips with a plurality of through-wires on the top semiconductor chip by eliminating the need of bonding wires on the top chip for the purpose reducing the chip size package. Also it would have been obvious to modify the invention of Chikawa et al. as taught by Dotta et al to form a bump between the semiconductor chips 301a and 301b for the purpose of reducing power loss.

Regarding claim 29 Figure 1(b) of Chikawa discloses all the claimed inventions as applied to claim 25. Chikawa teaches using a thick film wiring and an electrode pad formed together at the same height in order to stack chips. Chikawa does not teach using a separate bump as mentioned above. Also Chikawa lacks to teach the thickness of said thick-film wiring is the same as the height of said plurality of bumps. However, Figure 2 and 9 of Dotta et al. teaches using a bump 25 as connecting terminal between interposer 30 and first chip 1a, and between first chip 1a and second chip 1b. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to form a bump and a thick film wiring with the same height. Moreover, there is no evidence that indicates the height of the bump and the thick-film wiring be the same is critical and it has been held that it is not inventive to discover the optimum workable height of a result-effective variable with given prior art conditions by routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05

Art Unit: 4183

Note that the specification contains no disclosure the critical nature the claimed height of any unexpected results there from.

Regarding claim 30, the limitation "are formed by plating" is merely product-by-process limitation that does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product by process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thrope*, 227 USPQ 964, 966

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. US (6,836,002) in view of Dotta et al. (US 2004/0080040) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Saeki (US 7,132,752).

Regarding claim 27, Figure 1(b) of Chikawa et al. discloses a plurality of semiconductor chips 3 and 4 being composed of; a first semiconductor chip 3 that has a circuit surface on upper surface and thick-film wiring 6; and a second semiconductor chip 4 that is disposed above said first semiconductor chip 3, comprising; bonding wires 7 for electrically connecting said interposer substrate 2 and said thick film wiring 6.

Chikawa does not expressly teach the following limitations:

a plurality bumps for providing an electrical connection between said second semiconductor chip 4 and said thick-film wiring 6.

other bonding wires for providing an electrical connection between said interposer substrate 2 and said second semiconductor chip 4.

Art Unit: 4183

However, in the same field of endeavor Figure 13 of Dotta et al. teaches a bump (connecting terminals) 310 for providing electrical connection between said second semiconductor chip 301b and thick film wiring 303 (paragraph [0009]). Moreover, Figure 2B of Saeki teaches other bonding wires 148 for providing an electrical connection between said interposer substrate 100 and said second semiconductor chip 110-2, electrical signals are transmitted (col. 12 lines 5-7) between the circuit surface (top surface) of said second semiconductor chip 110-2 and said interposer substrate 100 (substrate) (col. 8 line 28-29) by way of said plurality through-wires 106 and said other bonding wires 148. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Chikawa as taught by Dotta et al. and Saeki to form bumps between the upper and lower chip for electrical connection in order to avoid using external wiring for the purpose of reducing chip packaging size.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. US (6,836,002) in view of Dotta as applied to claim 25 above, and in further view of Smola et al. (US 6,388,320).

Regarding claim 28, Figure 1b of Chikawa et al. discloses a stacked-chip semiconductor 3 and 4 electrical connection is formed from the interposer 2 by way of thick-film wiring 6 to the another semiconductor chip 4. Chikawa does not teach a spacer is formed with through wires disposed between the semiconductor chips 3 and 4. However, in the same field of endeavor Figure 2 of Smola teaches a spacer 7 formed with through-wires 17 is disposed between said semiconductor chip 1 and 10 for electrical connection (col. 4 lines 36-40). Therefore, in view of

Art Unit: 4183

such teaching it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Chikawa with the teachings of Smola et al. to use a spacer with through-wiring between semiconductor chips for the purpose of low power dissipation, less signal delay and for stacked-chip structural support.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. US (6,836,002) in view of Dotta et al. (US 2004/080040) and Sugizaki (US 2002/0041027).

Regarding claim 31, Figure 1(b) of Chikawa et al. discloses an interposer substrate 2, first semiconductor chip 3, a second semiconductor chip 4, first and second conducting member 7 for electrical connection (col.5 lines 55-60). Chikawa et al. failed to disclose the following limitations:

the first semiconductor chip 2 has a plurality of through-wires,
the second semiconductor chip 2 has a circuit on lower surface,
a first conducting member feeds at least one voltage selected from power supply and ground to a circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip, a second conducting member that feeds at least one voltage and ground to said circuit surface of said second semiconductor chip, wherein said first conductive member and said second conductive member are mutually independent routes.

However, in the same field of endeavor Figure 1(a) and 9 of Dotta et al. discloses a stacked-semiconductor device 40 comprising: an interposer substrate 30, a first semiconductor chip 1a that is disposed above said interposer substrate 30 and that has a plurality of through-wires 18; a second semiconductor chip 1b that is disposed above said first semiconductor chip

Art Unit: 4183

1a; a first conduction member 8a that feeds at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground to a circuit surface (paragraph [0007]); and a second conducting member 8a that feeds at least voltage selected from power supply voltage 8a and ground 8b (paragraph [0040]) to a circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip 1a; and a second conducting member that feeds at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage to said circuit surface of second semiconductor chip 1b, where in said first conductive member and said second conductive member are mutually independent routes (paragraph [0093]). Moreover, Figure 17 of Sugizaki teaches a stacked-semiconductor device comprising a second semiconductor chip 1-2 disposed on top of first semiconductor device 1-1, where the second semiconductor chip 1-2 has circuit surface (element formation surface) 2 (paragraph [0077]) on the lower surface. Therefore In view of such teaching it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Chikawa et al. with teachings of Dotta et al. and Sugizaki to form a first semiconductor chip with a plurality of through wires for a purpose of avoiding using external wiring which helps to increase the chip speed, to use the lower surface of the second semiconductor chip as a circuit surface for ease of connection, to form mutually independent first and second conductive members for first chip and second chip respectively for the purpose of stacking semiconductor chips which uses different power or voltage.

Claims 32, 34, 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. US (6,836,002), Sugizaki (US 2002/0041027) as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of Dotta et al. (US 2004/080040).

Art Unit: 4183

Regarding claim 32, Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki disclose all the claimed inventions as applied to claim 31. Chikawa and Sugizaki lack to disclose the second semiconductor chip 4 has a plurality of through-wires disposed on the said first semiconductor chip 3. However, Figure 1(a) and 9 of Dotta et al. discloses a stacked-chip semiconductor device 40, wherein the second conducting member 8c that feeds a power supply and ground to the circuit surface of said second semiconductor chip has a plurality of through-wires 18 disposed on said first semiconductor chip 1a, and at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground (paragraph [0040]) is fed from said interposer substrate 30 to the circuit surface of said second semiconductor chip by way of said plurality of through-wires 8a and 8c (paragraph [0093]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Chikawa et al and Sugizaki with the teachings of Dotta et al to form a second semiconductor chip 4 with a plurality of through wires for a voltage and ground that is fed from the interposer for the purpose of forming compact size chips and to reduce voltage drops caused by external wirings.

Regarding claim 34, Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki disclose all the claimed inventions as applied to claim 31. Chikawa teaches the semiconductor chips 3 and 4 are electrically connected with the package external lead 2a. Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki failed to disclose the first conducting member 7 feeds power supply voltage and ground to a circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip 3. However, Figure 9 and 13 of Dotta et al. discloses the stacked-chip semiconductor device 300, wherein the first conducting member that feeds a power supply and ground to the circuit (paragraph [0040]) surface of said first semiconductor chip 301a, and at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground is fed from said interposer

Art Unit: 4183

substrate 30 to the circuit surface of said first semiconductor chip by way of thick film wiring 303. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki with the teachings of Dotta et al. to use the first conducting member to feed power supply voltage and ground to semiconductor chip for the purpose of operating semiconductor devices.

Regarding claim 35, Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki disclose all the claimed inventions as applied to claim 31. Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki do not teach a plurality of bumps for electrically connecting and plurality of through-wires of said first semiconductor chip. However, Figure 2 and 13 of Dotta et al. discloses the stacked-chip semiconductor device, comprising a plurality of first bumps 25 for connecting the plurality of through-wires 306 of said first semiconductor chip 301a and said interposer substrate 30; and a plurality of second bumps 25 for electrically connecting the plurality of through-wires 306 of said first semiconductor chip 1a and said second semiconductor chip 1b (paragraph [0009]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki with the teachings of Dotta et al. form a semiconductor devices with a plurality of bumps and through wires by forming bumps to connect semiconductor chips for the purpose be reducing power loss and to form a semiconductor device with through wires for the purpose of fast signal response and forming small size package chips.

Regarding claim 36 and 37 Chikawa and Sugizaki disclose all the claimed inventions as applied to claim 31. Chikawa teaches using a thick film wiring and an electrode pad formed together at the same height in order to stack chips. Chikawa and Sugizaki do not teach using a separate bump as mentioned above. Also Chikawa and Sugizaki lack to teach the thickness of

Art Unit: 4183

said thick-film wiring is the same as the height of said plurality of bumps. However, Figure 2 and 9 of Dotta et al. teaches using a bump 25 as connecting terminal between interposer 30 and first chip 1a, and between first chip 1a and second chip 1b. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to form a bump and a thick film wiring with the same height. Moreover, there is no evidence that indicates the height of the bump and the thick-film wiring be the same is critical and it has been held that it is not inventive to discover the optimum workable height of a result-effective variable with given prior art conditions by routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05 Note that the specification contains no disclosure the critical nature the claimed height of any unexpected results there from.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa et al. US (6,836,002), Sugizaki (US 2002/0041027) as applied to claim 31 above, and in view Dotta et al. (US 2004/0080040), and further in view of Smola et al. (US 6,388,320).

Regarding claim 33, Chikawa et al. and Sugizaki teaches all the features previously outlined. Chikawa and Sugizaki failed to disclose a spacer that has plurality of through-wires is disposed between first and second chips and power is supplied from the interposer by way of through-wires of said spacer to the circuit surface of second semiconductor chip. However, in the same field of endeavor Figure 9 and 13 of Dotta et al. discloses a stacked-chip semiconductor device 300, where in a circuit layer (wiring layer with insulating film) 303 and 308 that has a plurality of through-wires 306 is disposed between said first semiconductor chip 301a and second semiconductor chip 301b, and at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground (paragraph [0040]) is fed from said interposer 30 (paragraph [0046]) by way of

Art Unit: 4183

though wires 8 of said first semiconductor chip 301a and the through-wires (309 and 310) of said spacer 303 to the circuit surface of second semiconductor chip 301b. Moreover, Figure 2 of Smola teaches a spacer 7 formed with through-wires 17 is disposed between said semiconductor chip 1 and 10 for electrical connection (col. 4 lines 36-40). Therefore, in view of such teaching it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Chikawa and Sugizaki with the teachings of Dotta et al. and Smola to use a spacer with through-wiring between semiconductor chips for the purpose of low power dissipation, less signal delay and for stacked-chip structural support.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF GEBREYESUS whose telephone number is (571)270-5765. The examiner can normally be reached on monday through thursday 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Landau can be reached on 571-272-1731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4183

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew C. Landau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
4183

/Y. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 4183